

Decision Record - Memorandum

Arrow Canyon Wilderness

Final Wilderness Management Plan and Environmental Assessment

Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Southern Nevada District Office
Las Vegas Field Office
Las Vegas, Nevada

October 24, 2013

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Decision Record	1
1.1. Compliance	1
1.2. Selected Action	1
1.3. Compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):	1
1.4. Public Involvement:	1
1.5. Rationale:	2
1.6. Appeal or Protest Opportunities:	3
1.7. Authorizing Official:	4
1.8. Contact Person	4

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Decision Record

*Arrow Canyon Wilderness — Final Wilderness Management Plan and
Environmental Assessment*

This page intentionally
left blank

1.1. Compliance

The *Proposed Action* alternative of Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2011-0099-EA, as revised, is in conformance with officially approved plans of other federal, state, local, and tribal governments to the extent those plans are consistent with federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. The *Proposed Action*, as revised, and *No Action* are in conformance with the goals, objectives, and decisions analyzed within the scope of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) *Record of Decision for the Approved Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement* (Las Vegas RMP) (1998).

1.2. Selected Action

It is my decision to approve and implement the Wilderness Management Plan (WMP) for Arrow Canyon Wilderness as described in the *Proposed Action* of EA DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2011-0099-EA, as revised. The EA, as revised, evaluates the impact of implementing the *Proposed Action* and Wilderness Management Plan on a variety of resources including fire management, fish and wildlife, invasive non-native plant species, migratory birds, recreation uses, special designations (other than Wilderness), special status animal and plant species, vegetation/soils/watershed resources, and wilderness. The Wilderness Management Plan establishes management direction for the Arrow Canyon Wilderness for a 10-year period.

1.3. Compliance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):

The *Proposed Action*, as revised, was analyzed in Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2011-0099-EA. I have determined, pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.2, that the *Proposed Action*, as revised, with design features and mitigation measures described in the Finding of No Significant Impact (incorporated herein), will not have any significant detrimental effects on the human environment, and thus does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

1.4. Public Involvement:

A Notice of Proposed Action was mailed to known interested parties in October of 2010. The first internal scoping meeting was held at the Southern Nevada District Office's (SNDO) Las Vegas Field Office on November 3, 2010 with a first interdisciplinary meeting. Public scoping workshops were held at the SNDO on November 8, 2010; the Moapa Court on November 9, 2010; and at the Mesquite Council Chambers on November 10, 2010. A site visit to Arrow Canyon was conducted on March 3, 2011 to discuss issues related to technical rock climbing. Attendees included the Access Fund and the Las Vegas Climber's Liaison Council, who provided technical expertise.

The Draft Wilderness Management Plan and Environmental Assessment was available for public review and comment April 12, 2013 through May 17, 2013. Tribal consultation was conducted during the public comment period whereby tribal representatives were notified of the availability of and opportunity to comment on the Draft WMP and EA. Comments on the Draft WMP and EA were received from the Nevada Department of Wildlife, Nevada State Historic Preservation Office, Nevada Division of Water Resources, Clark County Regional Flood Control District, Access Fund, Las Vegas Climber's Liaison Council, Southern Utah Climbing Alliance, and over 340 private citizens. Public comments and BLM responses are included in the EA, as revised.

Minor editorial changes were made to the *Proposed Action* in response to comments received. In addition to these minor editorial changes, the following modifications to the *Proposed Action* were made in response to comments received from the public. These revisions are the same as actions considered and evaluated under the *No Action* alternative, and therefore, did not require additional evaluation.

- The *Proposed Action* is revised to exclude designation of the 5 mile long Mesa Trail due to concerns raised during the public comment period. The Nevada Department of Wildlife raised concern regarding potential displacement of wildlife because the proposed Mesa Trail would have been in close proximity to a small-game wildlife water development and other critical water sources (i.e. tinajas). The Nevada Department of Wildlife also expressed concern regarding conflicts between hunters and other user groups due to the trail being located near wildlife water sources. In addition to comments from the Nevada Department of Wildlife, two private citizens commented that the proposed trail was not in an area where people currently hike and is not needed to preserve wilderness character.
- The *Proposed Action* is revised to exclude active restoration of approximately 5.0 miles of linear disturbance (i.e. two-track) from off road vehicle travel. This linear disturbance was proposed to be restored to a single-track route and designated as part of the Mesa Trail. Due to comments received and discussed above, the Mesa Trail will be excluded from the *Proposed Action*; therefore, restoration of the 5 miles of linear disturbance will not be implemented and will be allowed to restore naturally overtime. Restoration processes may be accelerated using methods detailed in the WMP and Programmatic Environmental Assessment for Restoration in Wilderness (NV-S010-201-0062).
- The *Proposed Action* is revised to exclude the installation of a portal sign at the wilderness boundary adjacent to the Mesa Trail. Because designation of the Mesa Trail is being excluded from the *Proposed Action*, the need to install a portal sign is unnecessary.
- The *Proposed Action* is revised to exclude the Table Mountain staging area which was proposed to be located at the intersection of Dead Man Wash and Pahrangat Wash, near Table Mountain. As discussed above, the Mesa Trail, which had a proposed trailhead near the Table Mountain staging area, is no longer being designated. Since no designated trails or other recreation developments will be located in the area around Table Mountain, designation of an official staging area is not necessary at this time. Dispersed parking outside of wilderness may continue as present. Additionally, no kiosks would be installed at this location.

1.5. Rationale:

Our decision to authorize the *Proposed Action*, as revised, does not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation. In conformance with the Las Vegas Field Office Resource Management Plan, implementation of the *Proposed Action*, as revised, will provide for the long-term protection and enhancement of the untrammeled and undeveloped character of wilderness, and provide for the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use of the planning area. The *Proposed Action*, as revised, promotes the enhancement and maintenance of untrammeled, naturalness, undeveloped, outstanding opportunities for solitude and/or primitive and unconfined recreation, and supplemental/unique values, while also managing other resource uses and values provided for in wilderness legislation. Actions to restore surface disturbances to a natural condition, designate trails and staging areas, provide a sign plan, manage recreation activity, guide wildlife management, and permit scientific

research are addressed. The *Proposed Action*, as revised, also includes measures to protect cultural resources and supplemental values of the area's unique geology, in addition to addressing monitoring, public outreach, and environmental education to assist resource protection efforts. Wilderness character would be maintained by requiring subsequent site-specific NEPA and Minimum Requirement Decision Guidelines analysis for additional actions, as necessary.

Opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation will be maintained under the *Proposed Action*, as revised. Measures to maintain naturalness by preventing the introduction and establishment of noxious and non-native invasive weeds are addressed. Actions to minimize negative impacts from small—scale surface disturbances and impacts on cultural resources, are evaluated. Scenic qualities and values of naturalness will be enhanced.

A *No Action* alternative was considered. Since no unresolved conflicts involving alternative uses of resources or options offering meaningful differences in environmental impacts were identified during the course of this analysis, the range of the two alternatives was considered to be sufficient.

1.6. Appeal or Protest Opportunities:

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA), Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 4 and Form 1842-1. If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days of the decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 2801.10 or 43 CFR 2881.10, for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the IBLA, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the IBLA and the appropriate office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof in demonstrating that a stay should be granted.

Standards for obtaining a stay

Except as otherwise provided for by law or other pertinent regulations, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits.
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting a stay.

1.7. Authorizing Official:

Timothy Z. Smith
District Manager, Southern Nevada District

10/24/13
Date

1.8. Contact Person

For additional information concerning this Finding, contact.

Sendi Kalcic, Wilderness Specialist
Las Vegas Field Office
4701 N. Torrey Pines Dr.
Las Vegas, NV 89130
702.515.5297